DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 177 FL 021 904

AUTHOR Mangubhai, Francis
TITLE Anatomy of a Good Second Language Teacher: What It Has To Say about L2 Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 93
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at an International Conference on Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching (2nd, Hong Kong, March 24-26, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Objectives; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Introductory Courses; *Language Teachers; *Personality Traits; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; Student Motivation; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Models of teacher training have tended to emphasize development of competencies in teachers that emphasize cognitive aspects of learning, and minimize affective factors. Second language teacher education has adopted this emphasis on learning as cognitive rather than as a strong interaction of cognitive and affective factors. In fact, affective factors are more important at the early stages of second language learning. Analysis of the classroom practice of a good second language teacher indicates that it is oriented toward development of the whole student and of appropriate affective states that enable students to learn more effectively. Salient features of good teacher behavior include treatment of students as persons whose needs are both intellectual and emotional. Transcripts of classroom videotape recordings illustrate the principles. Little emphasis is placed on personality factors in teacher hiring. More attention must be given to the role of attitudes in second language learning, particularly in the earlier stages. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 367 177

ANATOMY OF A GOOD SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHER:

WHAT IT HAS TO SAY ABOUT L2 TEACHER EDUCATION

Francis Mangubhai
University of Southern Queensland
Toowoomba
Queensland 4350
AUSTRALIA

Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching held in Hong Kong, 24-26 March, 1993.

FL021904

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Francis Mangubhai
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ANATOMY OF A GOOD SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHER:

WHAT IT HAS TO SAY ABOUT L2 TEACHER EDUCATION

Abstract

Models of teacher training have tended to emphasize the development of competencies in teachers which emphasize cognitive aspects of learning to the exclusion of, or at least to minimization of affective factors. While they get a mention and their importance in learning is emphasized, very little is done about ways in which affective factors have to be continually addressed during learning processes. Teacher education, explicitly or implicitly, has tended to inculcate an orientation towards the head with relative disregard for the rest of the person.

Second language teacher education has not escaped this influence - this emphasis placed upon learning as being primarily cognitive, rather than a strong interaction between cognitive and affective. indeed, it could be claimed that the latter has a predominant role at the early stages of exposure to a new field of knowledge, and influences the initial attitude to that field.

This paper argues that affective factors are more important i the early stages of second language learning. It analyses the teacher practices of a good SL teacher to show ways in which her teaching is orientated towards the development of the whole person and of appropriate affective states that enable students to engage in learning more effectively. Transcripts of video data are used to illustrate and support the claims made in the article. Implications for teacher education are also discussed.

Teacher education has recently moved from the development of perceptual and cognitive processes of the teacher which lead to particular types of action in the classroom (Gage, 1963) leading to outcomes, both stated and unstated to other approaches such as teacher-as-researcher, action research, clinical supervision, critical pedagogy and reflective teaching (Bartlett, 1990). These latter approaches have frequently been an add-on to the types of activities that make up the staple of basic teacher training, activities such as effective methods, developing a repertoire of competencies (such as effective questioning techniques), how to be a good decision maker and administrator in the classroom. In

particular, dimensions of instructional process such as feedback to students, time on task, types of questions asked in the classroom have related to learning outcomes. The emphasis in the teaching of these instructional practices has been largely cognitive.

Richards (1990) has queried whether information arising from studies of instructional practices in content-based subjects "help us identify what it takes to be an effective second language teacher" (p. 7). He has suggested that the goals of instruction in language classes are different and strategies to achieve them will therefore be different or may vary. He advocates a greater "theoretical" understanding of principles underlying the different competencies that are identified in teacher training courses. Moreover, he recommends a dual approach to the development of a teacher education program: a *micro approach* that looks at teaching in terms of directly observable characteristics, and a *macro approach* that addresses the issue of "clarifying and elucidating the concepts and thinking processes that guide the effective second language teacher" (p. 14). In both cases, the emphasis is on the development of cognitive competencies and imply that effective teaching in all contexts is a function of effective cognitive functioning in the classroom.

This paper argues that while an effective teacher education program needs to address both the micro- and macro-perspectives that Richards suggests, it does not take into account sufficiently the affective element which is also a very important variable in a second language classroom. This element is

particularly important at the early stages of second language learning when learners are attempting to overcome affective states that prevent them from becoming active participants in the learning of the second language. Lest there be any misunderstanding, the writer is not arguing that cognitive approaches in the classroom are not important in second language learning; rather the argument is that at the very early stages of second language learning, consideration of affective factors should be paramount in the minute-to-minute and myriad decisions that a language teacher has to make in the classroom.

It is this affective element that is not explored sufficiently in teacher education programs because the driving force behind these programs is a cognitive one. Underlying this orientation is the Descartian dualism and the philosophy embodied in "Cogito, ergo sum" (I think, therefore I am) and not the Rousseauan philosophy of "Sentio, ergo sum" (I feel, therefore I am). Cartesian duality has influenced education into separating 'mind' and 'body' and hence into regarding the function of education to develop the former.

There are, however, some educators who have tried to redress this imbalanced view of education and by implication an imbalance in teacher education programs, for example Brown (1971) suggested the term *confluent education* to refer to the "integration or flowing together of the *affective* and *cognitive* elements in individual and group learning" (p. 3). This has sometimes also been called "humanistic education". He defined *affective* as referring to the "feeling or emotional aspect of experience and

learning" (p. 4). He claimed that there was no intellectual learning without some sort of feeling associated with it. Conversely, he suggested that there were no feelings without an element of the mind or cognition also being involved. It would, as he suggested, simplify matters if

> we could somehow isolate intellectual experience from emotional experience, but at the moment this is possible only in textbooks and experimental designs. The cold, hard, stubborn reality is that whenever one learns intellectually, there is an inseparable accompanying emotional dimension. The relationship between intellect and affect is indestructibly symbiotic. (p. 11)

Anecdotal evidence supplied by teachers of intensive ESL courses to foreign students seems to bear testimony to this. Bouts of homesickness prevent any effective learning of ESL until the students have resolved the issue of operating in a foreign environment. Students may go through the routine of learning but find they cannot internalize much, almost as if, as Krashen (1982) has suggested, the affective filter is set too high and the input cannot reach the language learning mechanisms. In some senses, these students feel stripped of their personhood, as their own cultural behaviour patterns are no longer guiding maps in the foreign environment and the lack of adequate control over the second language reduces them to almost childlike utterances, unable to convey deeply-felt feelings or the knowledge that may be locked up in their heads.

In the context described above, the teacher's classroom behaviour has to incorporate behaviours which treat learners more than mere cognitive machines. Facilitation of learning requires an attitude

that places the affective element in the foreground of the activities that occur in the classroom. It is, as Rogers (1969, p. 109) puts it, "prizing the learner, prizing his feelings, his opinions, his person. It is caring for the learner, but a non-possessive caring. It is an acceptance of this other individual as a separate person, having worth in his own right". Richards and Rodgers (1986, p. 114) when discussing humanistic techniques conclude that these techniques "engage the whole person, including the emotions and feelings as well as linguistic knowledge and behavioural skills". It may be that it is this teacher factor - treating learners as possessing mind as well as emotions - that may offer an explanation why Method A in second language teaching, which is theoretically regarded as not as effective as Method B, may, in the hands of certain types of teachers (and, perhaps, in the context of certain types of students also) produce just as much learning, if not more than Method B.

Stevick (1990, p.) in a recent book called *Humanism in Language Teaching* concludes that

> "Kindness is more effective than coercion.
> Firmness is more effective than permissiveness."
>
> When students feel good about the course and about themselves, they will learn better than when they do not." (p. 143)

The rest of the paper deals with the teaching behaviours of a teacher which appear to be based on viewing the learners holistically and treating them as persons with intellectual as well as emotional needs. She has specialized in teaching learners

with elementary or elementary plus level of proficiency in English. Her caring but firm approach has resulted in almost a Pied Piper effect; she is able to get students to undertake all sorts of activities she organizes for them with few signs of a lack of enthusiasm that may be apparent in some other classes.

The data has been derived by video-taping her classes at the beginning stages of contact with new students. Seven sessions were videotaped during the first five weeks of the teaching, with most of them taped in the first two weeks in order to capture the changing relationships and behaviour patterns in the classroom. During the first two sessions both the cameraman and the author were present; thereafter, only the cameraman was present. The teacher took the class for the speaking and listening skills, while another teacher took the class for reading and writing. The two teachers worked closely together and frequently discussed the students' progress and language problems. The class was small but similar outcomes have been achieved by the teacher under study with larger classes previously. Students were at beginner plus or elementary levels.

The data will be presented under two headings: *affective factors* and *teaching techniques*.

AFFECTIVE FACTORS

PERSONAL INTEREST IN STUDENTS

A strong characteristic of this teacher, Ateca, is the interest she shows in learners as persons. At the beginning of a session, for example, she notices that a student is feeling hot and she comments on it, also adding that it was cold in the morning.

Another example that occurs in the midst of the lesson is when she notices an unusual expression on one of the students' faces and asks her whether she is feeling sick. In a later lesson, she finds out that a student seems to be squinting at the blackboard. Not only does she ask whether he is having some problems seeing the board, but she explains why she is concerned.

1 [After writing the word 'dialogue' on the whiteboard, she notices one of the students is squinting.]
T: Hiro, where are your glasses? Can you see?
H: Yes
T: You are squinting your eyes. Do you wear glasses?
H: No, I have not glasses.
T: You don't have glasses.
H: No.
T: But why are doing this, Hiro [miming]?
H: My eyes, more and more badly
T: Well, you should get your eyes checked, Hiro. If you are going to go on to University, you are going to be in a big classroom and the blackboard is right at the front. You won't be able to see.
H: Big classroom?
S1: Big classroom
T: Big classroom and you have to do a lot more more reading and if your eyes are not good you are going to have headaches. So you won't do so well. OK. Can you see this word? What is it? (Tape 7, #65).

The personal interest and the regard for her learners as persons can also be seen in the way she ensures that she pronounces the names of the students correctly. In fact, she mispronounces one of the Japanese students' names as Yoshinoli because the student substitutes [l] for [r]. It is only later in the lesson she discovers her error as this extract from the taped lesson shows:

2 [The teacher has forgotten the student's name and asks him to say it again. She writes it on the whiteboard as 'Yoshinoli', but she is corrected by another student.]
T: ah, hah... Yoshinori.
Y: Yes
T: Yoshinori, Yorshinori. Can you say it again please?
S: Yoshinori.
T: Yoshinori
S: Yes
T: I am wrong. You must tell me that I am wrong. Yoshinori, Yoshinori, Yoshinori ... OK, Yoshinori. [Tape 1, #564)

Another feature of this teacher's behaviour is she frequently touches her students. She does this quite naturally because she comes from a culture where touching is a means of showing affection, closeness and care for a person.

POLITENESS

Another attribute of this teacher is her politeness to her students. She sets them an example that she wants them to emulate. *Thank yous* and *pleases* abound in her lessons and are evident in the transcription extracts that follow.

SETTING STANDARDS FOR THE CLASS

Ateca Williams' personal interest in the students and her politeness do not imply a laissez affaire attitude in the class. She sets very definite grounds rules for behaviour in the class and insists on these behaviours. When she finds one of the students talking in Japanese, she makes it very clear that that is not acceptable in her class, as these extracts from two of her lessons show. In fact, the second extract shows her students enunciating the rule.

3A [A student has been using Japanese in the class.]
T: What's this? What's this? Is that English?
S: No Japanese. [A student enunciates the rule.]
T: No Japanese, very good. No Japanese. [Tape 1, #428]

3B [Once again a student has been using Japanese.]
S1: Don't speak Japanese in here. [enunciating the class rule]
S2: in the classroom
T: In the classroom. No Japanese in the classroom. [Tape 5, #9]

Having established a rapport and this is done quite rapidly, she can now reprimand students who do not behave as they are required to do in class, but it is done in such a manner that no offence

is taken. This extract is taken from one of her lessons in the second week:

4 [Written work has been handed in without the student's name.]
T: Mick, is this yours?
M: Yes.
T: How do you know? Nobody's name is here. Could be anybody's. Is this yours?
M: Maybe.
T: Maybe? Have you got your contact lenses on?
M: Yes, yes.
T: Good
M: It's mine.
T: Next time ...?
M: Next time ...
T: What?
M: write my name.
T: Next time write your name.
M: Write my name.
T: Good. [Tape 5, #17]

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

Ateca does not display qualities in class that only show her care for her students as human beings; her teaching behaviours show that she has internalised many of the qualities of a good communicatively-oriented teacher.

INVOLVEMENT OF THE WHOLE GROUP

The teacher displays a number of techniques for involving the whole class. These techniques have the effect of turning the class into a cooperative group where students help each other to learn. She asks others to report what a student has said thus requiring students to attend to others' speech. This combines both listening and speaking and ensures constant attention in the class.

5 T: Mick, could you please tell us where you come from, and tell us something about you[rself].
M: I am from Japan. I am 22 years old.
T: Yoshinori, what did Mick say? ... What did Mick say?
S1: 20 years old
S2: 22 years old
T: Hiro, ... you help me. Yoshinori, what did Mick say?
Y: He is from Japan and he is 23 years old.
T: Is that correct, Melody?
M: Taiwan ... no ... 20 years old.
T: 20, 22, 23. You have to listen. You have to listen.
M: 22 years old.
T: 22 years old.Thank you. [Tape 1, #115]

She also gets others to help those who cannot supply a answer thus emphasizing both cooperativeness in the class and care for other's learning. She thus turns her role from being a teacher to a facilitator in class.

6 [Teacher is doing some work on contractions.]
H: What do you mean by contracted form?
T: Somebody help Hiro, please.
S1: Maybe ... May I help?
T: Yes, certainly.
S1: Maybe if I say 'am', maybe you can apos...
T: apostrophe
S1: apostrophe 'm'. This I think are contractions.
T: You understand
H: Yes
[Teacher then begins to write down some examples of contraction on the whiteboard.] [Tape 5, #450]

This role as facilitator in the classroom is further emphasized when she turns questions asked of her back to the students, or asks students to comment upon the correctness of a person's response, as this example shows:

7 T: What's this?
S1: Arms
T: Right or wrong, everybody.
All: Wrong
T: Why? [to S1]
S1: Arms
T: Right or wrong?
All: Wrong.
T: Why? ... ask them.
S1: Why?
[A jumble of answers]

S1: Arm ... arm
T: Why? Why?
S1: Er, because my pronunciation is [indistinguishable]
T: No, no, Santosa, come on ..., what's this?
S1: Arm
T: Why? Why is it right? ... That's right, but why?
S1: Because [indistinguishable, but says 'no' repeatedly]
T: Everytime you say 'no', I'll ask you to give me 5 cents too.
S1: I say yes
T: Kuni, would you like to help Santosa?
K: This is arm, there is arms.
T: These are ...
ALL: arms
T: How many?
S1: Two.
T: Alright, what do you call them?
S!: Arms.
T: Arms, good, and this one?
S1: Arm
T1: No
S1: 's'
T: 's' Thank you. [Tape 5, #180]

TIME SPAN FOR STUDENT RESPONSES

A phenomenon that is sometimes seen in language classes is the very short time span within which students are expected to supply an answer. Alternatively, teachers sometimes, having paused for a short time and not receiving a response, move to another student for the answer. This does nothing positive for the image of the learner who has been passed over and if it happens a number of times, a negative message is sent to the learner who may begin to view himself or herself as a poor language learner. This teacher expects everyone to speak; her expectations of each student are high and the students constantly try to fulfil those expectations. The next extract shows the length of pauses as well as rephrasing that goes on in order to get a student to make an utterance.

8 T: Could you please tell us some more about yourself. Listen to each other please.
S1: Ah ... I can play ... gymnastic, gymnastic.
T: You are a gymnast.
S1: I ... (8) speak English not very much.
T: You are doing very well. Could you understand everything Mick said?
ALL: Yes.
T: Come on, keep trying, you have done very well. Would you like to tell us something about your family?
S1: Family? My father, my father ... works in [indistinguishable] Park.
T: And my mother ... (3) hairdresser. My brother, big brother student ...(3), university in Hoka.., University of ...(7) [An exchange with another student to establish the name of the university.]
T: Finished?
M: Yes
T: Very well, very well done. Anybody likes to ask Mick a question. [Tape 1, #185]

MORE LEARNING, LESS TEACHING

The classroom behaviours of Ateca suggest that she has internalized the dictum that a teacher may teach but ultimately it is the student who learns. In other words, teaching does not necessarily mean learning. Ateca therefore does not always supply the answers or clarification; rather she seeks these from the learners and only provides the answers when it is apparent to her that they may not be forthcoming. Here is an extract which shows the teacher seeking answers from the class, rather than providing them.

9 T: Contractions can be affirmative or negative. They are very common in everyday spoken English. Two new words for us there: affirmative and negative. Everybody. Affirmative [gets class to repeat the words after her].
ALL: Affirmative
T: Negative
ALL: Negative
T: If you look at the example done already, they have given you an affirmative and an example of a negative. Anybody like to make a guess which is the negative and which is the affirmative?
S1: [indistinguishable]

T: Yes, positive, yes, good. If it is positive, which is the negative of the examples?, You have two examples: 'I've ' and 'don't'. Which one is the negative one?
S1: Don't
T: Don't, good. The other one is affirmative. Mick, do you understand? Melody, you're OK? [Tape 5, #600]

CLEAR EXPLANATION

If students are expected to complete a task satisfactorily they must know what is required of them. Ateca Williams ensures that students understand exactly what they are required to do and will go to some length to ensure that every student is confident about what is required of him or her, as this extract at the end of the 5th session of taping shows:

10 [The teacher writes the word 'task' on the whiteboard.]
T: Have you read the instruction? Could you tell me what your task is, please? Do you remember this word? Do you, Hiro? Do remember, Melody? Do you remember this meaning of the word ... Kuni.
K: I remember the word ... [indistinguishable]
T: You remember the word but have forgotten the meaning. Do you remember? Good. Do you remember? ... Can't remember.
[a short segment of the tape omitted]
T: Remember I said to you everytime we have listening I will ask you to tell me what the task of each exercise is ... Do you now remember the word? meaning of this word? Task, everybody, task?
ALL: Task
T: What is your task? What is the exercise telling you to do? What must you do? What do you have to do? ... Hiro?
H: Look at the four pairs of the sentence meanings.
T: Good. Look at the sentences. What else? Look and then what? ... Your instructions tell you what to do. One, look at the sentence or the pairs of sentences. What's the next one? [A long pause - she goes on in this vein until the requirements of the task are clear to the students.] [Tape 5, #715].

DISCUSSION

The salient feature of this teacher's classroom behaviour is the treatment of students as persons whose needs are both intellectual and emotional. Her behaviour shows that there is, as Brown (1971, p.3) suggested when he advocated the concept of

confluent education, an "integration or flowing together of the *affective* and *cognitive* elements in individual and group learning." This is particularly important at the earlier stages of second language learning when limited proficiency in the second language places an extra emotional burden upon learners as they struggle to make themselves understood and are frequrntly forced by their limited proficiency to reduce their messages to more child-like topics.

One of the tyrannies of administration thrust upon teacher training institutions (and I might add, blithely accepted) is that the selection of potential teachers is based wholly on academic records and little value is placed upon the personalities of the trainees. Moreover, the teacher training programs have a cognitive orientation, the development of cognitive competencies that will enable teachers to develop knowledge or skills in their learners. In these circumstances, the probability of producing a teaching force that is not just cognisant of the importance of affective factors but is, in fact, truly oriented towards treating all learners as a composite of affect and intellect, with both elements exerting a powerful influence upon the learning that eventuates, is greatly diminished. Given these circumstances it is imperative that second language teacher education programs emphasize the role of emotion in language learning and give it due emphasis that it needs. Particular emphasis ought to be placed on its role especially at the earlier stages of language learning.

Teacher training programs can bring about a change by not simply stating the importance of affect, a form of genuflection, and then moving on to emphasise more cognitive behaviours in the classroom. Objectives, for example, which still tend to be behavioural in their formulation, ought to incorporate an element of affective outcome. This would tend to reinforce the importance of affect in learning and thus pave the way for a more humanistic teaching in our classrooms.

REFERENCES

Bartlett L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J.C. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education*. New York: CUP.

Brown, G.I. (1971). *Human teaching for human learning*. New York: The Viking Press.

Gage N.L. (Ed.) (1963). *Handbook of research in teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Richards J.C. (1990). The dilemma of teacher education in second language teaching. In J.C. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education*. New York: CUP.

Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T. (1986) *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Rogers, Carl (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Stevick, E. (1990). *Humanism in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.